

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<p>Application No. 10/527,975</p> <p>Examiner CHERIE M. WOODWARD</p>	<p>Applicant(s) LE BUANNEC ET AL.</p> <p>Art Unit 1647</p>
--	--	--

All Participants:

(1) CHERIE M. WOODWARD

(2) H. JAMES VOLLER

Date of Interview: 11 February 2010

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
26

Prior art documents discussed:
US Patent 7,887,811

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Claim 26 was considered for rejoinder. However, because of the claimed subject matter in US Patent 7,887,811, rejoinder of claim 26, as written, would have required an Obviousness Type Double Patenting rejection in light of the '811 patent. Applicant's representative authorized an Examiner's Amendment to cancel claim 26 in order to pass the case to issue.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Cherie M. Woodward/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)